**Factors which diminish acceptance of MVS as a subjective science**

*Lack of mathematical predictions:* Maharishi’s theory of human development through higher states of consciousness, arguably the most important theoretical element of his Vedic Science, lacks the ability to generally predict the time-frame in which any particular individual will develop these higher states (unlike, for example, Piaget’s theory of cognitive development).

*Non-falsifiability of theory:* Popper argues that in order for a theory to be considered scientific it must be possible to at least theoretically posit observations which would disconfirm it. This *demarcation principle* is widely accepted in modern science. The fact that all experiences during TM practice can be explained by the theory means there are no observables that can disconfirm the TM practice’s contribution to the theory of human development in Maharishi Vedic Science.

*Frequency of absolute statements:* Modern science, particularly in the area of social science research, only comes to tentative conclusions about the implications of research results for general theories about individual and social growth and development. Maharishi’s absolute claims about the influence of the TM-program and his Vedic Science in these areas contrasts sharply with this *tone*, because absolute claims are more frequently associated with religious or philosophical dogma than science.

*Unusual role of authority:* Although expert testimony is an accepted part of modern science, the predominant faculty reference to Maharishi’s presentation of his theory when answering questions from the students or presenting the theory, rather than their personal experience (research) and verification of that theory goes beyond what would normally be associated with expert testimony. Expert testimony is sometimes part of the genesis of a discipline; but once established it is usually supplemented by continuing research by scholars in the discipline.

*Uniform position of scholars on the theory:* In modern science, university faculty rarely subscribe to the same theory or interpret it uniformly, especially in the leading edge areas. Thus students observe the faculty, both in and out of class, debating points of theory. Outside of the context of objective research on the TM program, our students never experience MUM faculty debating theoretical elements of MVS (and they rarely even see it in the context of objective research).

*Proprietary knowledge:* Even though it isn’t uncommon for technologies to both have proprietary knowledge associated with them, and to have costs as well, for some reason the proprietary nature of the training associated with practice of TM creates difficulties on the feeling level with scholars at other universities. It may have something to do with the fact that we cite practicing TM as the means of verifying the claims in MVS, and then something about the fact that it costs money to learn TM somehow creates a bad feeling, perhaps a feeling of non-universality.